IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
APPELLATE SIDE
WRIT PETITION NO.7169 OF 2005

Shri Narsingh Vishnu Deshpande .... Petitioner
Vs.
State of Maharashtra & Anr. .... Respondents

Sarvasri G.S. Baj i/b S.N. Chandrachood,
Advocates, for the Petitioner.
Ms M.P. Thakur, Asst. Government Pleader,
for the State.

CORAM: R.M.S. KHANDEPARKAR &
NARESH H. PATIL, JJ.

DATED: AUGUST 16, 2006

P.C:

1. Heard. The petitioner by this petition is challenging the orders passed by the Administrative Tribunal complaining about denial of promotion to the petitioner. Undisputedly, the petitioner retired on 30-9-2004. Undisputedly, the records disclose that the promotions in respect of which grievance is sought to be made have been effected after the retirement of the petitioner. In any case, the grievance of the petitioner was rejected by the Tribunal by order dated 13-2-2004. Even the review application was dismissed by the Tribunal on 11-8-2004. The present petition has been filed on 30-8-2005. There is no whisper about the cause for the delay in approaching this Court in writ jurisdiction by one year even after the dismissal of the review application. In the course of the arguments, it was sought to be contended that the petitioner was

pursuing the remedy of contempt proceedings. It is well-settled law that contempt proceedings are not meant for any relief to the party complaining about the contempt of Court's order by the other party. The contempt proceedings are essentially to punish those who do not obey the Court's order or whose acts amount to illegal interference in the administration of justice. However, no relief as such can be granted to the complainant in such proceedings. The law in that regard has been reiterated in various decisions including the latest decision of the Apex Court in the matter of **Midnapore Peoples' Co-op. Bank Ltd. & Ors. v. Chunilal Nanda & Ors.,** reported in 2006 AIR SCW 2766.

2. In the absence of any cause being shown for the delay in approaching the Court, on the ground of laches itself, the petition is liable to be dismissed. Even on merits, there is absolutely no substance in the petition. Grievance is sought to be made in relation to the promotions granted after the retirement of the petitioner.

3. For the reasons stated above, there is no case for interference in writ jurisdiction. The petition, therefore, is dismissed.

(Naresh H. Patil, J.) (R.M.S.Khandeparkar, J.)

sjs/816wp7169.05